



# **GOVERNMENT PERFORMANCE PROJECT**

## **COUNTY GOVERNMENT SURVEY CAPITAL MANAGEMENT SECTION**

**April 2001**

### **PLEASE REFER QUESTIONS TO:**

Anthony Stacy  
Project Manager  
Alan K. Campbell Public Affairs Institute  
Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs  
Syracuse University  
306 Eggers Hall  
Syracuse, New York 13244-1090  
315-443-9707  
[gpp@maxwell.syr.edu](mailto:gpp@maxwell.syr.edu)

## CAPITAL MANAGEMENT

This section is designed to measure the extent to which your county engages in meaningful, long-range capital planning. This includes: consideration of the impact of capital projects on future operating and maintenance expenses; assessment of asset condition and replacement/overhaul forecasting; development of accurate information such as: future needs, cost analysis; prioritization and tracking of progress of capital projects.

### BACKGROUND TO THE GOVERNMENT PERFORMANCE PROJECT

Since 1996, under the auspices of The Pew Charitable Trusts, the Maxwell School of Citizenship & Public Affairs at Syracuse University, in partnership with *Governing* magazine, has rated the management performance of local and state governments and selected federal agencies in the United States. The project, called the Government Performance Project (GPP), is administered by the Maxwell School's Alan K. Campbell Public Affairs Institute.

The project aims to improve the understanding and practice of government management throughout the United States on the city, county, state, and federal levels. It evaluates the effectiveness of management systems by considering government performance in five categories: financial management, human resource management, information technology, capital management, and managing for results. Each category is addressed by a separate section in this survey. For each category, governments are evaluated based on this survey, interviews, and an analysis of published documents.

While the project highlights overall management capacity, it focuses on the role of leadership, the integration of the five categories, as well as the communication of government performance issues to the citizenry.

In 1998 the project studied and rated government performance of the 50 states and 15 federal agencies. The results were published in the February 1999 issues of *Governing* and *Government Executive*. The results were also widely reported by leading print, radio, and television media.

In 1999 the project evaluated government performance in the top 35 U.S. cities by revenue and of five federal agencies. These results were published in the February 2000 issue of *Governing* and the March 2000 issue of *Government Executive*.

In 2000 the GPP reevaluated the 50 states and the results were published in the February 2001 issue of *Governing*. This year the GPP will evaluate 40 county governments.

The Maxwell School will add the data collected to its clearinghouse of information and continue to expand this resource of government management practices. Ultimately, government entities will have the opportunity to learn from one another and exchange valuable information through the efforts of this project.

### GPP CONTACT PERSON

For more information on the GPP, please visit our website at: [www.maxwell.syr.edu/gpp](http://www.maxwell.syr.edu/gpp). If you have any questions regarding this survey or the GPP in general, please direct your inquiries to Anthony Stacy, at [gpp@maxwell.syr.edu](mailto:gpp@maxwell.syr.edu) or 315-443-9707.

## **CAPITAL MANAGEMENT EVALUATION CRITERIA:**

1. Government conducts thorough analysis of future needs.
  - Government has a formal capital plan that coordinates and prioritizes capital activities.
  - A multi-year linkage between operating and capital budgeting exists.
  - A multi-year linkage between strategic planning and capital budgeting exists.
  - Government has sufficient data to support analysis.
2. Government monitors and evaluates projects throughout their implementation.
3. Government conducts appropriate maintenance of capital assets.
  - Government has accurate data on current asset stocks and values.
  - Government appropriately insures assets.
  - Government has sufficient data to plan maintenance adequately.
  - Maintenance is appropriately funded.
  - Government conducts sufficient preventive maintenance to avert major and/or emergency repairs.

## **DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED IN THIS SURVEY:**

*Asset categories:* Components of capital assets (for example, roads might be one category, while buildings might be another).

*Capital assets:* Roads, streets, buildings, or other fixtures owned by the county that have a long life.

*Department:* Any administrative subdivision or unit of government (also in some cases called a board, bureau, commission, department, etc.) having the primary purpose of executing some governmental functions or laws.

*Maintenance:* Keeping capital assets in a workable condition.

## **INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING THE SURVEY ELECTRONICALLY:**

This document is a Microsoft Word form. A form is a structured document with spaces reserved for entering information. This survey, containing check-boxes and fill-ins, can be viewed and completed in Word.

- *To check a box:* Use your mouse to move the arrow over the box you want to check and click once. To uncheck the box, click again.
- *To enter text in a fill-in box:* Move your mouse over the gray box. The arrow will change to a cursor. Click once to highlight the box. Begin typing. All fill-ins have unlimited capacity.

To enable electronic completion, the file has been password protected. Text can only be written in fill-in boxes. To provide comments on a question, include a separate page of comments with reference to the question number.

If you encounter difficulties completing the survey electronically, you may contact the project manager at (315) 443-9707 for troubleshooting assistance. The document can also be printed and filled in manually.

**PLEASE SUBMIT THE FOLLOWING DOCUMENTS AND INFORMATION WITH THE SURVEY: (Note: *If these materials are available online, you may simply identify the URL at which they may be found.*)**

- ☒ Copies of policies that govern the project planning and management processes
- ☒ Copies of countywide short- and long-term capital plans.  
In addition, please include the General Services and Capital Improvement Plans for the following:
  - ☒ Architecture and Engineering Services
  - ☒ Real Estate Services
  - ☒ Fleet and Facilities Management
  - ☒ Purchasing and Contracting
  - ☒ Housing and Community Development
  - ☒ Transportation and/or transit development
  - ☒ Department of Education and/or county schools
- ☒ Any studies or evaluations (such as performance audits) that address how the county is discharging its capital management function
- ☒ Reports for roads, streets, and buildings describing the inventory of capital assets and their condition (for example, reports produced from the Pavement Management System on road condition)
- ☒ Copies of reports produced by the project management system, such as progress tracking reports for capital projects
- ☒ Cost/benefit studies used for evaluating capital projects
- ☒ Published estimates of the operating cost impacts of capital projects (including maintenance and utility costs)
- ☒ Audits of the capital planning and management system
- ☐ Audits of construction management practices
- ☒ Documentation that demonstrates compliance with GASB 34 requirements
- ☒ Several examples of capital project requests made by departments as part of the capital budgeting process
- ☒ From the county transportation department, recent transportation needs reports

**PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS ABOUT CAPITAL MANAGEMENT:**

*(Note: Please exclude information technology from your answers. Information technology is addressed in a separate section of this survey. Also, if roads and transportation are handled separately from the management of other capital in your county, please provide information about both roads/transportation and all other areas. If you wish, you may submit two copies of this survey: one for roads and one for all else.)*

1. Please answer the following questions about the capital planning process in your county:

- a. Is there a central county office that coordinates capital planning? ☐ No ☒ Yes

If so, please identify this organization and describe its role.

Overall coordination of capital planning takes place in the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), with policy direction and final budgetary approval coming from the five-member Board of Supervisors (BOS). However, all internal and external stakeholders are involved in the capital planning process. For example, the Finance Department may prepare a cost/benefit analysis for a potential acquisition, or the OMB may commission a study as to the cost of staffing a new facility.

In addition to its policy and budgetary responsibilities, the BOS is also involved by appointing members to citizen planning and advisory boards that prioritize and then monitor the construction of detention, transportation and flood control projects.

Initially, capital planning takes place in four County departments: the Facilities Management Department (FMD) is responsible for general purpose government needs; the Criminal Justice Facilities Development Department (CJFDD) is responsible for the design and construction of detention and criminal justice facilities; the Maricopa County Department of Transportation is responsible for roadways and bridges; and the Flood Control District is responsible for dams and other flood control structures.

General government and criminal justice projects must be reviewed by the County's Facilities Review Committee (FRC) before consideration for inclusion into the County's five-year Capital Improvement Plan. FRC consists of (1) FMD Director (Chair), (2) OMB Director, (3) CJFDD Director, (4) Chief Financial Officer, (5) Elections Department Director, (6) Deputy County Administrative Officer, and (7) Superior Court Administrator. This make-up ensures representation from appointed departments, elected offices, and court administration. The committee operates under the authority of Administrative Policy Number A1920 "Facilities Capital Improvement Program" and reviews all capital projects estimated to cost \$150,000 or more regardless of the availability or source of funds. The FRC also ensures that all projects are in line with the County's Strategic Plan. The policy was approved by the Board of Supervisors in September, 1999. (Please see the Administrative Policy Number A1920, CM-1.a.-1.)

Upon departmental completion and FRC review, all departments' capital plans are submitted to the OMB for consolidation into a comprehensive five-year capital improvement plan for the entire County. Lastly, the BOS has the final decision

authority on which projects receive funding in any given fiscal year, through the adoption of the budget.

Please review the following attachment:

CM-1.a.-1 Administrative Policy Number A1920 "Facilities Capital Improvement Program" for further clarification.

- b. Does your county produce a Capital Improvement Plan (CIP)? ☐ No ☒ Yes

If so, what time period does the CIP cover?

The County Capital Improvement Plan is a five-year plan that provides a detailed description of each major project, project expenditures by year, funding sources and responsible departments. The plan also shows the budgeted and actual expenditures from the previous year and variances between original cost estimates and current cost estimates.

Please review the following attachment:

CM-1.b.-1 County Capital Improvement Plan as included in the Annual Business Strategies for further clarification.

---

- c. How often are countywide capital plans updated? Every one years
- d. How often are department capital plans updated? Every one years
- e. Please describe the role of county departments in the capital planning process.

All County departments actively participate in the capital planning process. In May 1999, under the leadership of the County Administrative Officer and with the assistance of Arizona State University, the Maricopa County Leadership Team conducted an offsite conference that began the process of formalizing a long-term capital plan for general County government. The planning horizon was the next twenty years.

This plan began with the identification of strategic business goals and evolved into the development of a series of Master Plans for the County's various operating campuses including Downtown Phoenix, Durango Business Center, Southeast Regional Center, and the Maricopa Medical Center. A document entitled, "Vision 2020, Maricopa County, Arizona, Management Team Facility Planning Retreat" documented this planning process. Each Master Plan committee consisted of senior leaders from departments located at that particular campus and was chaired by a department director or equivalent. The committees were aided, as needed, by contract architects and planners. The Master Plan formalizes future facility needs of County government at each major business location and is used as a basis for



determining which projects are recommended for inclusion in the five-year capital improvement plan. (Please see the Vision 2020 attachment, CM-1.e.-1.)

Please review the following attachment:

CM-1.e.-1 Vision 2020, Maricopa County, Arizona, Management Team Facility Planning Retreat.

2. Please answer the following questions about how projects are selected to be included in the capital plan:

a. Are formal criteria used to rank all projects?

☐ No ☒ Yes *(If so, please attach a list of these criteria.)*

b. Are projects evaluated and prioritized by a formal committee?

☐ No ☒ Yes

If so, please describe the composition of this committee. If not, please explain who decides what projects are included in the capital plan.

As discussed in our response to question 1.a, the Facilities Review Committee (FRC) must review all general government and criminal justice projects. Each departmental request must be accompanied by a thorough justification and must be consistent with the facilities' master plan. The FRC makes recommendations to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) as to what projects should be included in the County's five-year Capital Improvement Plan (CIP). This committee also reviews the progress of approved projects for timeliness and adherence to budgets. All requests for CIP budget adjustments are also reviewed by this committee before consideration by the OMB and the Board of Supervisors (BOS). (Please see the attached FRC documentation, CM-2.b.-1.)

For criminal justice projects, the County utilizes the Criminal Justice System (CJS) Master Plan, which is based on an exhaustive study conducted by citizens of Maricopa County in late 1997. That study analyzed growth trends and provided a system assessment for both the adult and juvenile criminal justice systems in Maricopa County for a 15-year period ending in 2012. (Please see the CJS Master Plan, CM-2.b.-2.)

The County developed its Jail Expansion Program (JEP), facility designs and initial project priorities based on the CJS Master Plan in coordination with the major user departments. Any changes to the priorities are based on an analysis of nine key factors and must be approved by the Citizens' Jail Oversight Committee, which was appointed by the BOS. (Please see the attached Jail Expansion Program, CM-2.b.-3.)

The JEP is laid out in annual increments through 2003 and reviewed annually by the Facilities Review Committee (FRC) to ensure that it is compatible with the County's CIP. It is also reviewed by the BOS and by the Citizens' Jail Oversight Committee. (Please see attached documentation for information on the Citizens' Jail Oversight Committee, CM-2.b.-4.)

There are two internal committees that play a role in evaluating and prioritizing transportation projects, and one formally appointed citizens' board that assists in the project development and selection process. The Transportation Improvement Program Review Committee (TIPRC) consists of staff representatives from all the Maricopa County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) divisions as well as representatives from County Parks and Recreation, County Planning and Zoning, and the Flood Control District (FCD). The committee prioritizes projects and makes recommendations to the Project Review Committee (PRC). (For additional information on the TIPRC, please see CM-2.b.-5.)

The PRC consists of the MCDOT division managers and meets monthly to review recommendations from the TIPRC. The PRC's recommendations are forwarded to the Maricopa County Transportation Advisory Board (TAB) for review and approval before projects can be advanced to the BOS. (Please see the attached documentation for more information on the PRC, CM-2.b.-6.)

The TAB was created by the BOS and consists of five citizen members appointed by the BOS. The TAB receives reports from the MCDOT staff, solicits citizen input and makes formal recommendations for capital improvements to the BOS. (For additional information on the TAB, please refer to CM-2.b.-7. For information on this process, please refer to the attached Capital Project Development Manual, CM-2.b.-8 and the .pdf file of this report on the accompanying CD.)

The FCD utilizes a Project Evaluation Committee which is comprised of the CIP/Policy Branch Manager and the division managers of the District's Engineering, Lands and Right-of-Way, Regulatory, and Operations & Maintenance divisions. All of these individuals have extensive flood control experience and knowledge of regional flooding issues. (For specific information, please review the CIP Prioritization Procedure Summary for FY01-02, CM-2.b.-9.)

Please review the following attachments:

- CM-2.b.-1 Facilities Review Committee documentation
- CM-2.b.-2 Criminal Justice System Master Plan, Volumes I through V, dated 11/12/97
- CM-2.b.-3 Jail Expansion Program (JEP)
- CM-2.b.-4 Citizens' Jail Oversight Committee (CJOC)
- CM-2.b.-5 MCDOT - Transportation Improvement Program Review Committee (TIPRC)
- CM-2.b.-6 MCDOT - Project Review Committee (PRC)
- CM-2.b.-7 Maricopa County Transportation Advisory Board (TAB)

CM-2.b.-8 Capital Project Development Manual

CM-2.b.-9 CIP Prioritization Procedure Summary for FY01-02

- c. Are any of the following a part of the capital planning and project selection process?  
(Please check all that apply.)

- ☒ Public hearings (Please specify how many per year: see below)
- ☒ Capital planning committees with citizen members
- ☒ Formal submission of capital requests by community groups or individual citizens

Please describe the role of citizens in capital planning.

The County has utilized several different forums for sharing information and soliciting citizen input regarding our general government projects. These forums include:

Master Plan Open House events have been conducted in downtown Phoenix for the benefit of all citizens and affected business owners that surround the County downtown campus. These Open House events are hosted by the County Supervisor whose district encompasses the downtown Phoenix area.

Public meetings have been held with the appropriate Village Planning Committees including the downtown committees and the Durango committees.

The County Administrative Officer and the Phoenix City Manager established the Phoenix Downtown Advisory Committee to provide input to the County on high profile Capital Improvement Plan projects located in downtown Phoenix. This committee, whose members are active participants in both the public and private sector in downtown Phoenix, provides Maricopa County with advice in such areas as project siting, exterior design and landscaping, and how projects can best contribute to future betterment of the downtown area. (For information on the Phoenix Downtown Advisory Committee, please see CM-2.c.-1.)

The City of Phoenix and Maricopa County partnered in the development of a Streetscape Development Guide for Jackson Street, a street that runs through the County downtown Phoenix campus, upon which several large County CIP projects will be built over the next 3 years. The process used in the development of this Guide (copy furnished earlier under the category of "Capital Improvement Plan for Architecture and Engineering Services") included extensive involvement of Jackson

Street interested citizens and business owners through the use of early evening design workshops. (Please see the attached Streetscape Development Guide, CM-2.c.-2.)

With regard to detention facility projects, the Citizens' Jail Planning Committee conducted a total of 15 public meetings and 4 public hearings. These meetings and hearings were conducted in each Supervisor's District. Virtually every municipality in the County participated in the study and was represented in the respective public meetings in order to ensure municipal input. In addition, several community workshops were held to solicit input and citizen involvement. (For information on the Citizens' Jail Planning Committee, please see the attached documentation, CM-2.c.-3.)

The County continued an open dialogue with the City Citizen Planning Boards and a Downtown Advisory Committee during the programming and facility design phase. The Downtown Advisory Committee was an important contributor because membership included the Phoenix Community Alliance and Downtown Phoenix Partnership representing the business community; the Phoenix Central City and Estrella Village Planning Committees representing neighborhoods; the Phoenix Historic Preservation Commission; the Central City Design and Architectural Review Panel; the American Institute of Architects; the Citizens' Jail Oversight Committee; the Phoenix Arts Commission; the Maricopa County Planning Commission and the City of Phoenix. The Downtown Advisory Committee used specially prepared project Review Guidelines to ensure consistency in its work. (Please see the attached Transportation Improvement Program, CM-2.c.-4, and the Transportation Management System Report, CM-2.c.-5.)

During design of the Forensic Science Center, two additional entities were involved: The Legislative Governmental Mall Commission, which has approval authority on such projects located in the Capitol Mall Zoning Overlay District, and the Capitol Mall Association which represents the neighborhoods in the Capitol Mall District. In addition, the Criminal Justice Facilities Development Department conducted public meetings with various neighborhood and activist groups to obtain their input and comments and collaborated with the City of Phoenix to conduct additional public workshops and meetings. Results of these collaborations were used in the design development of the facilities, project schedules and ultimately, in the capital plan.

The Citizens' Jail Oversight Committee now represents the principle channel to the public whether they are organizations, community groups or individuals. In each of its public meetings, the Committee not only receives formal reports from County departments on the Jail Expansion Program, but also public input. The Committee provides guidance to the departments executing the program and makes recommendations and periodic reports (at least two per year) to the Board of Supervisors.

For transportation projects in FY99-00, 52 meetings were held throughout the County involving 6,990 citizens. At each meeting, all citizen comments were documented, questionnaires were distributed, and the immediate staff involved in the project were present to talk to the public and listen to their comments. All citizen questions are responded to in writing, and comments were considered and included in the final reports for each project.

In addition to public meetings, MCDOT has a web page that includes the entire Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). The TIP is available for viewing or downloading at the following site [www.mcdot.maricopa.gov/PlanTIP/plantip.htm](http://www.mcdot.maricopa.gov/PlanTIP/plantip.htm). Also included is the entire Transportation Management System Report that includes current and historic performance data for each of the transportation systems such as roadway congestion, safety, roadway condition and bridges, which can be viewed at [www.mcdot.maricopa.gov/PlanRptStud/pgmsys/tms.htm](http://www.mcdot.maricopa.gov/PlanRptStud/pgmsys/tms.htm). The public may also contact MCDOT via e-mail through the Maricopa County Web page. Since September, 2000, MCDOT has received and responded to 246 initial e-mail inquiries and 23 follow-up questions. (<http://www.mcdot.maricopa.gov>)

In addition to the on-site public meetings, the MCDOT Transportation Advisory Board (5 citizen members) typically holds 9 to 10 public hearings each year to discuss the capital programming process, the annual update to the CIP, and interim changes to the program due to significant project cost increases, project scope changes, schedule changes, or other items related to the program. (For further information, please refer to the attached Capital Project Development Manual, previously referenced as CM-2.b.-8, and the Public Meeting Report, CM-2.c.-6 and the .pdf files on the accompanying CD.)

The majority of formal capital requests for the Flood Control District's CIP come from local municipalities and agencies. Each project has a series of public meetings at key milestones. These meetings are designed to both solicit public input and provide the public with information about the study or project.

The Board of Directors of the Flood Control District has appointed a citizen's Flood Control Advisory Board (FCAB) which consists of seven members. By statute, (§ARS 48-3611), such a board must consist of at least five citizen members. The FCAB recommends (to the Board of Directors) their approval or disapproval of the recommendations made by the Project Evaluation Committee. (Please see the attached Flood Control Advisory Board documentation, CM-2.c.-7, and the §ARS 48-3611, CM-2.c.-8.)

Please review the following attachments:

CM-2.c.-1 Phoenix Downtown Advisory Committee

CM-2.c.-2 Streetscape Development Guide

CM-2.c.-3 Citizens' Jail Planning Committee

- CM-2.c.-4 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)
- CM-2.c.-5 Transportation Management System Report
- CM-2.c.-6 MCDOT Public Meeting Report
- CM-2.c.-7 Flood Control Advisory Board (FCAB)
- CM-2.c.-8 §ARS 48-3611

d. Is the county's legislative body involved in the project selection process?

☐ No      ☒ Yes

If so, please describe its role.

The five-member County Board of Supervisors (BOS) has the final decision authority on which projects receive funding in any given fiscal year. This is accomplished through the approval of the annual budget. The BOS also appoints members of the public to advisory boards that participate actively in the project selection process.

The BOS receives monthly updates and periodic presentations on the status of the programs, approves each contract and agreement within the program, and approves the annual operational and capital budgets (including any adjustments).

The BOS may recommend potential projects that arise via requests from either citizen or various other jurisdictions within the County. The Facilities Review Committee objectively evaluates each of these requests against all other existing and potential projects, with the results of the evaluation reported back to the BOS.

The BOS was actively involved in the development of the Maricopa County Department of Transportation Comprehensive Plan and the more specific Transportation System Plan (TSP). The TSP adopted specific policies in developing the hierarchy of routes and establishing priorities for funding. (For additional information, please refer to the attached MCDOT Comprehensive Plan, CM-2.d.-1, and the Transportation System Plan, CM-2.d.-2 and the .pdf files on CD.)

Please review the following attachments:

CM-2.d.-1 MCDOT Comprehensive Plan

3. Please answer the following questions about your county's Capital Improvement Plan:

- a. Is the CIP coordinated with comprehensive county and/or department strategic plans?

☐ No      ☒ Yes

If so, please describe how the plans are coordinated.

All departments (with the exception of capital improvement projects developed by the Flood Control District (FCD) and the Department of Transportation (MCDOT)) utilize the Facilities Review Committee (FRC). During the submission of a project by any requesting department to the FRC for consideration, the department must update the committee on its Strategic Plan. This plan must address in detail how the department accomplishes its mission, where its facilities are located in the County, and how its current and future facilities contribute to that mission. This process facilitates the integration of departmental and County missions and strategic plans into the capital decision-making process. This linkage provides a clear understanding of the project's value and furnishes the means for the committee to evaluate and prioritize projects based on importance and strategic significance.

In addition to utilizing the FRC, the Criminal Justice Facilities Development Department (CJFDD) abides by the Criminal Justice System Master Plan initiated in 1997. The master plan was embraced and fully supported by the Board of Supervisors (BOS) and is the foundation of the Jail Expansion Program (JEP). In fact, JEP now represents one of the BOS Chairman's key goals for the current year. The BOS ensures that this program remains strictly aligned with its strategic priorities through the Citizens' Jail Oversight Committee, the FRC and the annual capital and operational budget process.

Because of their unique nature, the FCD and MCDOT currently employ separate planning procedures. These include intergovernmental agency collaboration and prioritization based on an established list of ranking criteria for designated types of projects.

Transportation projects identified for inclusion in the Transportation Improvement Plan must be consistent with the objectives outlined in the Comprehensive Plan as well as the Transportation System Plan. These two plans strategically provide long-range goals as well as anticipated needs of the regional transportation system. Relationships between transportation and other regional issues such as land use, environmental and economic considerations are also identified and discussed. By

outlining long-term objectives and needs, these plans allow for prioritizing the expenditures of County resources. These plans continue to be a collaborative effort among various divisions within MCDOT and numerous other County departments (i.e. Planning and Development, Parks and Recreation, and the FCD). Since the County CIP covers a five-year period of time, MCDOT takes the opportunity to integrate those projects that address strategic goals within the existing five-year plan. (For further information, please review the Maricopa County FY00-01 Annual Business Strategies document, pages 131-143, CM-3.a.-1.)

The FCD coordinates strategic planning with the CIP during the District's annual management retreat. During this retreat, strategic issues are identified and strategic plans and goals are developed. Once again, the CIP covers a five-year period of time, and the District takes the opportunity to integrate those projects that address strategic goals within the existing five-year plan.

Please review the following attachment:

CM-3.a.-1 County Annual Business Strategies

- b. Are all types of assets included in your county's CIP? ☐ No ☒ Yes

If not, what major types of assets are excluded?

All capital improvements are accounted for in the County CIP. However, all types of assets are actually included in the main CIP and a sub-system. Maricopa County defines capital improvements in its Policies and Procedures, Policy Number B5011, "Capital Budgeting" issued January 1999. This policy states that a capital project is "a project resulting in the construction, renovation, or acquisition of infrastructure or real property costing more than \$150,000 with an expected useful life of many years." Examples include roads, bridges, buildings, and right-of-ways. (Please see the attached Capital Budgeting Policy, CM-3.b.-1.)

In addition, capital fixed assets are tracked by the Finance Fixed Asset Sub-System. A fixed asset is defined in the Maricopa County Fixed Asset Property Manual as "an item that costs \$5,000 or more and has a useful life of at least one year." Examples of these asset types are land, buildings, improvements (other than buildings), equipment and vehicles. (Please see the attached Fixed Asset Property Manual, CM-3.b.-2.)

Please review the following attachments:

CM-3.b.-1 Budget Policy Number B5011 "Capital Budgeting"

CM-3.b.-2 Maricopa County Fixed Asset Property Manual



- c. What information is included in the CIP? *(Please check all that apply.)*
- ☒ Summary tables of capital projects by department, program and fund
  - ☒ Summary tables describing the financing plan for the proposed capital projects
  - ☒ Projections of debt ratios for the proposed financing plan
  - ☒ Detailed descriptions of projects
  - ☒ Detailed justifications for projects included in the plan
  - ☒ Glossary of terms
  - ☒ Description of the capital planning process
  - ☒ Information on actual capital spending by department
  - ☒ Estimates of the impacts of capital projects on operating costs
  - ☒ Other *(Please specify: Individual maps and one large foldout map of all projects, current project schedules and their history (deferred, accelerated, deleted etc.), photographs of complete projects, and a table showing maintenance expenditures.*\_\_\_\_\_)

4. Please answer the following questions about cost estimation:

- a. Does your county make formal estimates of the operating and maintenance cost impacts of capital projects?
- ☐ No      ☒ Yes *(If so, please attach documents that show budget estimates.)*
- b. Who makes these estimates?

The estimates for the operations, maintenance, and utilities of County buildings are usually made by the Facilities Management Department's Operations and Maintenance Division.

With regard to criminal justice projects, the initial Master Plan estimate of capital and operating costs was developed by the Citizens' Jail Planning Committee and incorporated in the Master Plan in November 1997. These estimates were the basis of discussions with the state legislature to determine the level and type of funding that could be included in the 1998 voter initiative. (Please see the attached 1998 Voter Initiative, CM-4.b.-1.)

For transportation projects, the Maricopa County Department of Transportation Operations and Construction Division makes estimates for future roadway maintenance. The estimates are based on the past year's roadway operations and

the roadway condition assessments. The County's Roadway Management System monitors the condition and sufficiency ratings for all County roads on an annual basis. These condition assessments are the indicators of how well County roads are maintained. (Please see the attached Roadway Management System documentation, CM-4.b.-2.)

The Flood Control District no longer assumes full operating and maintenance costs for its projects. Intergovernmental agreements between the District and other governmental agencies generally require the outside agencies to assume either partial or full responsibility for operating and maintaining the structures. If the intergovernmental agreement states that the District will share in the operations and maintenance of the structure, the project manager meets with the District's Operations and Maintenance Division and provides them with the description of the project, the estimated date of completion, and technical details. The Operations and Maintenance Division then extracts from its database the historical costs for performing the same type of maintenance on similar structures. This information is adjusted for the new structure and is added to the Operation and Maintenance Division's budget request.

Please review the following attachments:

CM-4.b.-1 1998 Voter Initiative

CM-4.b.-2 County's Roadway Management System

c. Where are these estimates published?

Initially, these operating and maintenance estimates are furnished to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) and the Chief Financial Officer for review. When the Facilities Review Committee evaluates a project, the estimates are, scrutinized again. These estimates are then published as part of the particular department's annual operating budget or as part of a project's authorizing agenda item along with the record of County Board of Supervisors (BOS) approval.

For criminal justice projects, cost estimates were based on the Master Plan but were refined as a result of developing the Jail Expansion Program (JEP). This report was also presented to the Board of Supervisors (BOS) and was published widely within the County. The JEP estimate became the base budget for incorporating these operational and capital costs into the annual budget, and cannot be changed without BOS approval.

All estimates for future roadway maintenance are published in the Maricopa County Department of Transportation annual operating budget and are approved by the BOS.

5. Please answer the following questions about your county's project tracking process:

- a. What county offices or departments are involved in the capital project tracking process?

The Office of Management and Budget and the Finance Department track overall capital spending. Both departments review budget variances on a monthly basis to ensure that expenditures are at appropriate levels. In addition, County departments are also responsible for tracking their own projects. The Facilities Management Department and the Facilities Review Committee (FRC) track the progress of individual general government projects. Significant changes to any program must be approved by the FRC and then the Board of Supervisors (BOS).

In addition, the Criminal Justice Facilities Development Department is responsible for executing and tracking the individual criminal justice projects. However, in the broadest sense, each of the 54 stakeholders that receive the monthly status report can track the Jail Expansion Program (JEP). Because of the size, complexity and visibility of the JEP, the Citizens' Jail Oversight Committee, the BOS, and the FRC perform oversight tracking.

Many County departments utilize specific project tracking procedures in addition to those outlined above. For instance, all divisions within the Maricopa County Department of Transportation are involved in the capital project tracking process. From the point at which a project enters the Transportation Improvement Plan, a project team consisting of a Project Manager, a Right-of-Way Coordinator and representatives from Community and Government Relations Division, Environmental/Archaeological Branch, Public Information Branch, and Utilities Branch is formed. When the project comes within six months of bidding, Contracts and Operations become involved and are part of the team. Each division manager is a member of the Project Review Committee that meets monthly to track progress on projects.

- b. Which of the following best describes the process your county uses for tracking the completion of capital projects after their approval? *(Please check one.)*
- ☐ We do not have a formal capital project tracking process.
- ☐ Capital projects are formally tracked at the department level only.

- ☐ Capital projects are formally tracked at the department level, with an informal process at the central level.
- ☒ Capital projects are formally tracked at both the department and the central level.
- ☐ Capital projects are formally tracked almost entirely at the central level.

6. Please answer the following questions about reporting on capital projects:

a. How often are detailed project management reports produced? (*Please check one.*)

- ☐ Never
- ☒ Monthly
- ☐ Quarterly
- ☐ Semi-annually
- ☐ Annually
- ☐ Other (*Please specify:* \_\_\_\_\_)

***Please attach examples of project management reports to this survey.***

b. Which types of information are reported about ongoing capital projects?

- ☒ Originally scheduled date of completion
- ☒ Estimates of project delays
- ☒ Project budget overruns
- ☒ Revised estimates of costs
- ☒ Significant changes to the project (change orders) or scope of work
- ☒ Programmatic workload changes
- ☒ Explanations for delays and budget overruns

c. Who produces these reports?

The Facilities Management Department produces the reports for the majority of County projects; the project's manager, architect, or engineer furnishes information

for reports. Reports are then consolidated by the respective departments prior to dissemination.

The Criminal Justice Facilities Development Department (CJFDD) produces its own reports, as does the Maricopa County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) and the Flood Control District (FCD).

For transportation projects, the Senior Primavera Scheduling Engineer within the Engineering Division produces the Primavera based reports. Many customized reports are prepared for special purposes for various team members. The Project Database Specialist and the Expedition Specialist prepare other reports annually or on an as-needed basis. The Database Specialist also maintains project web pages.

At the Flood Control District, each study or project manager produces individual contract reports monthly. The Planning and Project Management Division then consolidates these reports into monthly and annual reports.

- d. To what county offices, departments, or elected officials are they provided?

The Facilities Management Department (FMD) forwards its monthly report via e-mail to: all County elected officials, County and Deputy County Administrative Officers, all County Service Officers, all affected Department Directors, the Superior Court Presiding and Associate Presiding Judges, the Superior Court Administrator, the County Public Information Officer and all members of the Facilities Review Committee. Additionally, the report is posted on the department's website at (<http://www.maricopa.gov/femd/default.htm>). The FMD CIP project reports are also furnished to the citizens and officials by FMD.

The Criminal Justice Facilities Development Departmental reports are available on the CJFDD website at <http://www.cjfdd.com/>. The CJFDD report distribution includes:

County

Each Member of the Board of Supervisors

Clerk of the Board (public copy)

County Administrative Officer

16 County Departments

City of Phoenix

City of Phoenix Municipal Court

Citizens' Jail Oversight Committee

Each Member

Project Internal

Each Architect

Civil Engineering Consultant

Environmental Consultant

Program Manager (Publisher of the Report)

Consultants (Alternative Dispute Resolution)

CJFDD Staff

Construction Testing Consultant

Engineers

In reference to transportation projects, monthly standard reports are distributed to all interested parties within the department and to the public. A complete report of the status of the Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP) is prepared annually and distributed to the Board of Supervisors (BOS), cities, other agencies, and citizens. It lists each project, a short summary of the work to be performed, the latest cost estimate, project partners, anticipated construction date, detour information and contacts for additional information. In addition, project schedules are routinely prepared for public meetings, the Board of Supervisors, other governmental agencies, and various consultants and contractors. Project summaries are posted on the Maricopa County Department of Transportation web page for each project. Specialized reports are also distributed as requested by individuals.

Within the Flood Control District (FCD), the individual contract reports produced by each study or project manager are sent to internal District staff. The reports are also presented monthly at the FCD's project status update meeting which is attended by various staff members from the Planning and Project Management, Administrative, Lands and Right-of-Way, and Engineering Divisions. The consolidated monthly and annual reports are provided to the Chief Officer of the Public Works Agency and to the Office of Management and Budget.

7. Please answer the following questions about condition assessments:

a. How often does your county conduct condition assessments, on average?

- ☐ Never
- ☐ At least quarterly
- ☐ At least semi-annually
- ☒ At least annually
- ☐ At least biannually
- ☐ At least every five years
- ☐ Less frequently than every five years

b. Who is responsible for performing condition assessments in your county?

For County buildings, the Operations and Maintenance Division of the Facilities Management Department is primarily responsible for performing annual condition assessments. Additionally, the Design and Construction Division ensures extensive coordination with the Operations & Maintenance Division and the Major Maintenance Planner regarding conditions observed during the course of executing major maintenance projects on County facilities.

The Maricopa County Department of Transportation Operations and Construction and Engineering Divisions conduct condition assessments year round. Due to the size of the roadway system, (more than 2,700 miles), and the number of bridges and structures, (242) it takes two years to complete each inspection cycle. Here are two examples of how assessments are made:

Roadways are field inspected and evaluated using a Pavement Condition Rating with a 1 to 100 point scale, the International Roughness Index which has a 1 to 500 scale and a sufficiency rating on a 1 to 100 scale. The sufficiency rating grades the roadway's physical characteristics compared to adopted local and national design standards.

Bridges are inspected and ranked using the Federal Bridge Inspection criteria. This is a 1-100 ranking that takes into consideration numerous criteria from traffic volumes to the structural integrity of the structure.

(For additional information, please refer to the attached Federal Bridge Inspection Criteria, CM-7.b.-1, the Roadway Project Rating Process, CM-7.b.-2, and the MCDOT Project Scoring Program, CM-7.b.-3, documentation.)

The condition assessments for the Flood Control District's (FCD) structures are made on either a quarterly or annual basis depending upon the type of structure. The following entities perform the assessments: the FCD Operations and Maintenance Division, the FCD Structures Assessment Branch of the Planning and Project Management Division, the Arizona Department of Water Resources, and other state or federal agencies.

Please review the following attachments:

CM-7.b.-1 Federal Bridge Inspection Criteria

CM-7.b.-2 Roadway Project Rating Process

CM-7.b.-3 MCDOT Project Scoring Program

- c. Please explain how condition assessments are used in the process of making decisions about asset maintenance.

An annual condition assessment is just one piece of information that is used by the Facilities Management Department Planning Division's Major Maintenance Planner to formulate a draft master list of future Major Maintenance projects for the five-year budget process. These assessments (along with condition observations made by staff engineers, technicians, field trades specialists and tenant department facility coordinators), form the basis for identifying all major maintenance requirements. (Please see attached various condition assessments, CM-7.c.-1.)

For transportation projects, condition assessments are initiated for each roadway segment, bridge, and structure on an annual basis. Due to the size of each grouping (roadway segment, bridge, and structure), the inspection process is completed in a two year cycle. For roadways, a pavement condition rating is used along with the International Roughness Index. Upon inspection, each roadway is given a sufficiency rating which measures its physical characteristics. Soon after an asset is evaluated, its resulting score is entered into either the computerized Roadway Information System database or the Bridge Inventory database. The databases are then queried to identify substandard roadways or bridges with respect to both their physical conditions and functional capabilities. The resulting values are further evaluated based on specific target values previously established by MCDOT for roadways and the federal government for bridges and structures.

Bridges are evaluated using the Federal Sufficiency Rating process. The results of the annual inspection are also reported, evaluated and ranked in the Transportation Management System Report. (Please see the Capital Project Development Manual,



previously referenced as CM-2.b.-8, for additional information concerning how the Candidate Assessment Report, CM-7.c.-2, and Design Concept Report, CM-7.c.-3, studies function in the final selection process for selecting transportation improvements.)

The Operations and Maintenance Division of the Flood Control District maintains files and licenses (if applicable) on each and every structure. (Please see attachment: Examples of Structure Licensing and Inspection Reports, CM-7.c.-4.) Each structure goes through an annual inspection and evaluation. Depending upon the severity of the problems, the structure would be scheduled for either repair or maintenance, or possibly for further assessment.

Please review the following attachments:

CM-7.c.-1 Condition Assessments

CM-7.c.-2 Candidate Assessment Report

CM-7.c.-3 Design Concept Report

CM-7.c.-4 Structure Licensing and Inspection Reports

8. Please answer the following questions about capital needs assessment in the table below:

	Streets and roads	General government buildings (such as office buildings)	Other county government facilities (such as parks, jails, utility infrastructure, etc.)
a. For which of these does your county maintain a complete inventory of its assets?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. For which of these is information about the age of	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

the asset included in the inventory?			
c. For which of these is a condition rating of the asset included in the inventory?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. For which of these are the dates of the last major renovations of the asset included in the inventory?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. For which of these are any building or other code violations included in the inventory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f. For which do inventories include information about historical landmark or other special designations?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g. For which do inventories include information about energy efficiency?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h. For which of these are the estimated costs to bring the asset to good condition included in the inventory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i. How frequently is each of these inventories updated?	Every <u>one</u> years	Every <u>one</u> years	Every <u>one</u> years
j. Who is responsible for maintaining each of these inventories?			

Streets and roads: Maricopa County Department of Transportation

General government buildings: Facilities Management Department - Operations Division & Maricopa Integrated Health Systems Facilities

Other county government facilities: Maricopa Integrated Health Services (County Medical Center), Parks and Recreation Department (Parks), Flood Control District (Flood Structures)

9. Please answer the following questions about maintenance:

- a. Please describe the policies that guide how maintenance is funded.

Department maintenance budgeting is based on the output of maintenance services. The Maximo software system tracks each maintenance activity by cost, service type, employee, and building number, permitting a determination of actual annualized costs for maintenance operations. This system permits FMD to utilize the Maintenance Costs Per Gross Square Foot Spreadsheet when funding maintenance. This document itemizes maintenance costs associated with the operation of three different types of facilities that represent the majority of the type of facilities owned by the County: detention facilities, general office facilities, and parking structures.

Its format is used for budgeting purposes for all new facilities. This includes fully burdened in-house personnel costs, materials costs for in-house personnel, and service contract costs. All new position costs include first time start-up equipment, such as vehicles, clothing allowances, safety apparel, communications equipment, tools, etc. to outfit new employees.

The Criminal Justice Facilities Development Department (CJFDD), FMD, Finance Department, and Office of Management and Budget (OMB) collaborated on a study to determine the maintenance requirements and costs for the new jail facilities coming on line in the next three years. Steady-state annual operations and maintenance estimates were made using industry standards, data from like facilities in different areas and historic data from existing like facilities. Estimates included maintenance costs with and without annual utility costs. During the next budget cycle, a policy will be presented to the Board of Supervisors recommending the establishment of a designated reserve fund to finance the long-term maintenance costs of these facilities. The funding will come from the dedicated criminal justice sales tax. (Please see the attached CJFDD Study: Cost Regarding Maintenance, CM-9.a.-1.)

For transportation projects, the County Transportation System Plan (TSP) establishes the policies that guide how maintenance is funded. One of the primary management guidelines is to maintain the existing transportation system. Only after the maintenance and safety needs of the County are reasonably met are funds allocated for capital projects. (For additional information on the TSP, the MCSCORE process, CM-9.a.-2, and the Transportation Management Systems Report (previously referenced as CM-2.c.-5) that addresses pavement quality, please see the attached documentation, and the .pdf files on the accompanying CD.)

At the Flood Control District, the highest priority for the annual expenditure of funds is for operations, maintenance, and repair of existing flood control facilities as follows:

Maintenance and repairs necessary to ensure the safe operations and the structural integrity of facilities, and to assure the operation of facilities in accordance with the design/construction capabilities and local sponsorship agreements between the District and federal agencies, or intergovernmental agreements with municipalities in the County. This funding shall take precedence over other operational or capital improvement projects.

Preventative maintenance and repairs necessary to prevent or reduce damages or deterioration resulting in future repairs. This funding may be prioritized after the allocation of funds necessary to complete capital projects in progress.

Maintenance and repair of landscaping, aesthetic treatment, and maintenance access roadways in accordance with the original design/construction or to project a positive image of the District. This funding may be prioritized after the allocation of funds to initiate Comprehensive Plan projects, but before the allocation of funds

for cost-sharing in capital projects with other municipalities. (Please see the attached documentation, "General Policies Concerning the Allocation of Fiscal Resources to Accomplish the District's Functions and Responsibilities", CM-9.a.-3.)

Please review the following attachments:

CM-9.a.-1 CJDFF Study: Cost Regarding Maintenance

CM-9.a.-2 MCDOT - MCSCORE process

CM-9.a.-3 General Policies Concerning the Allocation of Fiscal Resources to Accomplish the District's Functions and Responsibilities

- b. Does your county produce formal estimates of the cost of bringing county government infrastructure (e.g. public buildings, highways, roads, streets, and bridges) up to good condition?

☐ No ☒ Yes *(If so, please attach copies of these estimates.)*

- c. Which county departments or offices are responsible for producing these estimates?

The following are responsible for producing estimates:

Facilities Management Department for buildings,

Maricopa County Department of Transportation for roadways,

Flood Control District for flood control structures,

Parks and Recreation Department for parks, and

Maricopa Integrated Health System for the Maricopa County Medical Center.

- d. How often are these estimates produced?

The estimates are produced annually and are incorporated into the budget proposal for the upcoming fiscal year.

- e. Please describe the methodology used for making these estimates.

For County buildings, each building system is evaluated separately. The Facilities Management Department (FMD) looks at current condition, life-expectancy, and

historical information of recently experienced costs for replacement/repairs. Some estimates are performed on a square footage basis, while others are made based on measurable capacity requirements. Estimates are normally prepared by experienced professionals or technical staff personnel. Building evaluation determinations are furnished to the FMD Planning Division's Major Maintenance Master Planner for insertion/prioritization in the upcoming fiscal year's Major Maintenance budget planning cycle.

For transportation projects, the methodology used to identify transportation estimates follows these steps:

1. Estimate the cost of each transportation need;
2. Sort each type of transportation need into an operations and maintenance need, a capacity enhancement need, or a new facility need;
3. Classify the relative time frame in which the need will occur; and
4. Add the estimated costs, based on project type and time frame, to a summary matrix.

(For more specific information on the methodology used in estimating maintenance and capital needs for transportation, please refer to the attached 1999 Transportation Needs Assessment and Funding Options Study, CM-9.e.-1. Also, see the .pdf files included on the accompanying CD.)

The Operations and Maintenance Division of the Flood Control District maintains a maintenance database that contains compiled yearly maintenance costs by activity and type of structure. This information, along with annual inspection reports for the structures, is used to project the costs and types of maintenance the existing structures will require. Maintenance for new structures is predicated on the compiled yearly maintenance costs by activity for similar types of structures.

Please review the following attachment:

CM-9.e.-1 1999 Transportation Needs Assessment and Funding Options Study

- f. What are the current estimates for the funding levels needed to bring infrastructure to good condition?

The current estimate is \$125,514,490 over the next five years for County buildings, not including the Maricopa County Medical Center, Flood Control, or

Transportation Department buildings. Current Facilities Management Department's building condition assessments estimate the backlog of major maintenance to be \$70,627,490 for non-detention facilities and \$30,387,000 for detention facilities. A comprehensive listing of major maintenance projects grouped by building is found in the County's annual budget document in the section entitled, "Major Maintenance Project Summary" (see previously referenced attachment CM-3.a.-1). Additionally, RNL Design was contracted by the County to do a needs assessment and master plan of the criminal justice detention system, which is summarized in the document entitled "Maricopa County Criminal Justice System Planning, Final Report, Volume 1 - Executive Summary, November 12, 1997" (see previously referenced attachment CM-2.b.-2). In it, the maintenance costs for the existing adult and juvenile detention facilities over a five-year period were estimated to be \$24,500,000.

The Maricopa County Medical Center is quickly outgrowing the existing infrastructure. The Maricopa Integrated Health System (MIHS) is determining whether to renovate and upgrade the hospital or completely replace it. In a study performed by Quorum (the management group that runs the hospital) in 1997, it was estimated that it would cost \$32,106,500 to bring current infrastructure up to good condition. The estimate for replacement is approximately \$200 million over the next ten years. The Strategic Planning Committee is currently studying this problem and will make a recommendation to the BOS within the next several months. (Please see previously referenced attachment CM-9.b.-1.)

For transportation estimates, please refer to the 1999 Transportation Needs Assessment and Funding Options Study. It should be noted that more than 91.3 percent of the County's roadways are currently classified as very good to excellent with respect to pavement condition and that 77.2 percent are rated average to very smooth with respect to pavement roughness. (Please see the attached Transportation Needs Assessment Report, pages 14 and 40 for further details, previously referenced as CM-9.e.-1.)

The Flood Control District estimates that it will need approximately \$8 million per year for ordinary maintenance and repair of its structures. Since the Flood Control structures are coming to the end of their designed lifespans, the District estimates that it will need approximately \$100 million over the next ten years to bring about major repairs or build replacement structures.

- g. For the past two years, how does actual capital funding compare to these estimates?

The comparison is actually very favorable. The County is currently being funded at approximately \$21.8 million annually; \$16.4 million from general government, and \$5.4 million from jail tax (for use exclusively for detention facilities). (Please see the FY99-00 Comprehensive Annual Financial Report, CM-9.g.-1.)

The MCDOT Capital Improvement Program for these same years was very favorable. MCDOT programmed \$55.5 million in FY99 or 36 percent of total revenues. In FY99-00, programmed capital expenditures were a more realistic \$59.4 million or 30 percent of total revenues. However, the previous two years are not necessarily representative of the long-term trend in revenues estimated to be received by MCDOT. While MCDOT anticipates increased revenues each year due to the rapid population growth and gasoline tax revenues, the wear and tear on roadways will also grow accordingly as will the need for increased capacity on the existing roadways. There is a projected deficit in funding for both maintenance and capital projects as identified in the MCDOT Needs Assessment and Funding Options Study. (For further information, please see the MCDOT Needs Assessment and Funding Options Study, page 40, previously referenced as CM-9.e.-1, or in the .pdf file on the accompanying CD.)

For the past two years, the Flood Control District has been able to budget the \$8 million it needs for routine repair and maintenance.

Please review the following attachment:

CM-9.g.-1 FY99-00 Comprehensive Annual Financial Report

- h. Please describe your county's needs and funding plans for new infrastructure or major renovations.

Needs: As far as County buildings are concerned, Maricopa County has far outgrown its current inventory of facilities and has had to significantly increase the need to lease office space for approximately one third of its administrative departments. With the cost of leased space continuing to climb, cost/benefit studies have shown that in the long run, the County is financially better off to invest in a new Public Service Building than to continue to lease. The County is planning to build a 700,000 square foot office building scheduled for completion by the end of 2003. Additionally, another significant need is for an expansion of adult and juvenile detention facilities to alleviate the significant over-crowding of the County jails. (Please see the attached Staubach Report for further details, CM-9.h.-1.)

Maricopa County Department of Transportation conducted a Transportation Needs Assessment and Funding Options Study in November of 1999. The needs analysis performed for this study shows that about \$2.85 billion (1998 dollars) will be needed to pay for anticipated facility capital and maintenance needs on the MCDOT System through 2020. (See the attached Transportation Needs Assessment and Funding Options Study for further details on actual maintenance and capital needs, previously referenced as CM-9.e.-1.)

Many of the Flood Control structures will soon be coming to the end of their design life and need to be either rehabilitated or replaced. As the structures come up for rehabilitation, redesign, or replacement, they will be presented to the Project Evaluation Committee and prioritized for the Capital Improvement Plan.

Funding Plans: The new County Public Service Building, as well as the remainder of the five-year Capital Improvement Plan, will be financed from the sale of tax exempt Certificates of Participation. The first sale will be in June 2001, for \$130 million. Of this, \$125 million in cash has been designated and transferred to the Debt Service Fund to make the debt service payments. With regard to the criminal justice projects, a jail tax was approved by the voters of Maricopa County with a ceiling of \$900 million. A portion of the \$900 million will be reserved to fund the long-term major maintenance needs for detention facilities. The needs and funding plan are discussed in the answer to questions 9.a. The Criminal Justice Facilities Development Department was established to manage the design and construction program for new detention facilities. The Facilities Management Department is responsible for major maintenance upgrades for existing detention facilities.

Please review the following attachment:

CM-9.h.-1 Staubach Report

10. Please answer the following questions about information technology:

- a. To what extent are any of the following information technology systems used to support capital management in your county? *(Please check as appropriate.)*

	This system is not in place.	This system is in place, but <b>does not</b> meet our needs.	This system is in place, and <b>partially</b> meets our needs.	This system is in place, and <b>fully</b> meets our needs.
A project management database or project tracking software	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
An automated system that tracks condition and maintenance information	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
An automated inventory management system	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



A Geographic Information System (GIS)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
An integrated financial system that includes capital management functions	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- b. If your county has an integrated financial management system that includes capital planning and/or inventory functions,

Who is the vendor? American Management Systems for the Advantage Financial System (Advantage 2.0.1) & Best FAS for the MIHS financial system.

When was the system implemented? MM/YR: 4/01 & 7/97, respectively.

- c. Please describe any other information technology systems your county has that support capital management.

The Advantage General Ledger system tracks all capital spending by department and project. The Fixed Asset Module of the system maintains a listing of all County capital assets. Use of the system in the monitoring of capital spending is the responsibility of the Office of Management and Budget, the Finance Department, and all involved departments. Because of the individual needs for advanced reporting on departmental projects, each of the departments involved in the Capital Improvement Program utilizes different types of information technology systems, which are specific to their functions. Therefore, to ensure a complete understanding of each type of technology, each department is listed separately.

The Facilities Management Department's Operations and Maintenance Division currently uses the MAXIMO Computerized Maintenance Management System to provide capital asset management and financial management control over all County-owned facilities. Utilizing MAXIMO provides the Division the capability to track, trend, and provide detailed analyses of all facilities. In addition, it provides details on the funds expended to maintain them on such items as: contract services, in-house labor, support staff, dispatching functions, commodities, tools and equipment, and other associated costs. The MAXIMO system also provides the ability to display collected data/information in a variety of formats.

The Criminal Justice Facilities Development Department and the KMD Justice Consultants (Kaplan McLaughlin Diaz/Daniel C. Smith and Associates) use a

combination of Prolog, Primavera and Microsoft Access to meet the needs of the Jail Expansion Program. These programs and their specific uses are listed below:

Prolog is a Project Management database that is used to manage and track various elements of each project including submittals, shop drawings, requests for information, potential cost changes, meeting minutes, safety observations, daily work observations and correspondence. Upon completion of each project, the electronic file can be maintained to provide a record of the project. (Please see the attached Meeting Minutes (done in Prolog), as an example, CM-10.c.-1.)

Primavera is a Critical Path Method scheduling program prepared and maintained by the contractor for each project and monitored by CJFDD. Primavera is required by contract and is a major tool in managing the entire construction process including construction activities, construction change impacts, submittal and shop drawing processes, and contractor billings. The program ties the cost of each activity to contractor billing to allow a more accurate comparison of actual progress. The Primavera schedule is updated weekly and submitted monthly to CJFDD as a part of the contractor's payment application. All potential changes are required to include an impact analysis schedule as a part of the contractor's request for additional costs. These schedules become a part of the permanent record of the project and are required to mitigate potential claims. (Please see the attached copy of a Primavera Schedule, CM-10.c.-2.)

The Jail Expansion Program (JEP) budget and costs are monitored in a Microsoft Access database created specifically for CJFDD, entitled "Jail Expansion Tracking System" (JETS). Budget and cost information is collected on each project, purchase, contract and invoice charged to the JEP to ensure effective financial management. The following reports are available: projected and actual cash flows, project cost tables by various categories, contract/purchase order details by contractor/vendor, and trending analysis of changes. The JETS is very flexible in its design to allow a broad view of the entire JEP or a detailed view of a specific project. (Please see an example of an attached JETS Report, CM-10.c.-3.)

Additional information technology systems used by the JEP include a public access web site ([www.cjfd.com](http://www.cjfd.com)). The web site provides information on the JEP and is easily navigated through specific project, budget, schedule, and bidding information. A copy of the current monthly report is included on the web site. This report details cash flow and schedule status, as well as a summary overview. Because the JEP is funded by a sales tax that restricts the expenditures to those items identified in Proposition 400, CJFDD makes every effort to keep the public informed of how those dollars are being spent.

Maricopa County Department of Transportation uses Primavera Project Planner Version 3.0. From this program, there are 178 reports available. Of these reports, 47 are routinely prepared and distributed. Primavera has the demonstrated capability to sort and report information by project manager, right-of-way agent, utility coordinator, intergovernmental agreement coordinator, archaeological,

environmental, contract, and construction categories. This allows each right-of-way agent (for example) to receive customized reports showing which activities are scheduled to be complete that month for all projects the agent has been assigned. This allows both the individual and management to know what is expected that month.

The following are example reports:

The key report is the monthly project status report (LT-26), which contains all projects sorted by project manager. It is updated monthly and is used for the monthly project status meeting. The report provides at a glance, what projects have "slipped" since the last report and since the start of the fiscal year, and gives a responsible person for each activity currently in progress. Management can quickly identify problems and begin resolving them in a proactive manner.

A copy of the Project Status Report (LT-26) is attached. The report is typically distributed electronically over the network by converting to a .pdf format and placing in Microsoft Outlook where all interested parties within MCDOT can print a copy. It is the primary means of providing schedule and cost information to MCDOT staff and management. (Please see the attached copy of the LT-26, CM-10.c.-4.)

The LT-38 is one of the reports generated monthly, which is designed for project managers or specific project team members. A copy of this report is included as supplemental documentation and a part of this package. It is designed to alert project managers and team members to activities that require updating. It also provides baseline information so that team members can see how the project is progressing since the beginning of the fiscal year. (Please see the attached copy of the LT-38, CM-10.c.-5.)

An example of a management level report is the LT-13, which is provided to the Engineering Division Manager. This report is designed to give the manager an idea of what is currently happening with the projects for which he is responsible. (Please see the attached copy of the LT-13, CM-10.c.-6.)

The LT-02 is a listing of all projects currently in the database. The list includes the subproject code (a 2-digit code used by the software to assign activities to projects), description, project manager, right-of-way coordinator, the overall duration, the project start date, and other pertinent information. This report is produced monthly and provided to branch managers. (Please see the attached copy of the LT-02, CM-10.c.-7.)

The LT-17 is an example of a report that compares the current schedule with the baseline (July) schedule. It is sorted by project manager and only reports specific milestones. This report is distributed to all project managers and the Engineering Division Manager. (Please see the attached copy of the LT-17, CM-10.c.-8.)

Expedition is project-tracking software which supports the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) project management. (Please see an attached example of an Expedition Project Tracking Report, CM-10-c.-9.)

Currently, MCDOT also uses the StratBENCOST benefit-cost/risk analysis software developed by the National Cooperative Highway Research Program.

StratBENCOST offers two software models, one for network analysis and one for single segment analysis. It allows opportunities to compare “do nothing” scenarios, maintenance only scenarios, full reconstruction scenarios, or another construction alternative scenarios. StratBENCOST can also be used to compare two maintenance scenarios, analyze intersection projects, assess network projects, and analyze several other types of roadway projects. The software currently defines: Total Discounted User Benefits; Net Benefits (Net Present Value); Discounted Capital Costs; Benefit/Cost Ratio; Internal Rate of Return; Payback Period; Discounted Vehicle Operating Costs; Discount Accident Costs; Discounted Vehicle Operating Time Costs; Discounted Emissions Costs; Discounted Maintenance Costs; Discounted Right-of-Way Costs; and Discounted Other Costs. (For further information, please see the benefit cost analysis results reports, CM-10.c.-10, or the .pdf files on the accompanying CD.)

MCDOT has developed additional software tools in-house to supplement StratBENCOST.

The first tool, the Annual Benefit Calculator, calculates the annual user benefit stream based on the total user benefits output from StratBENCOST. Annual user benefits are used by MCDOT to determine when constructing a project becomes economically beneficial. The annual user benefits are then input into the second tool, the B/C Comparison Analyzer.

The second tool, the Benefit/Cost Comparison Analyzer, is used to compare various user-defined benefit-cost scenarios. The B/C Comparison Analyzer compares user benefits, capital costs and benefit-cost ratios for any combination of projects and construction years with any other combination of projects and construction years. By doing so, MCDOT can optimize investments by recommending projects for their optimum time of construction. The B/C Comparison Analyzer also allows the comparison of a single project giving differing alternatives or the advantages of delaying or advancing a project.

The third tool, the Network Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) and Vehicle Hours Traveled (VHT) calculates data for input into the StratBENCOST Network Analysis Model. The Network VMT and VHT Calculator takes structure and traffic data for up to 5,000 individual road segments and calculates the results and the miles of roads. These values are categorized by the roads’ functional types for direct input into StratBENCOST.

In FY00-01, over 160 benefit-cost analyses were done on MCDOT’s potential projects where benefit-cost cost analysis could be done. This represents an

estimated 95% of all the projects in the MCDOT Transportation Improvement Project (TIP). It includes projects that are currently in the planning stages and projects that were identified with potential problems in the Small Area Transportation Studies. MCDOT's internal policy is to require projects to have a benefit-cost ratio of 2.0 or greater before they can be constructed unless other non-economic factors such as safety or legislative mandates require otherwise. The types of projects analyzed include capacity enhancement, safety, bridge, bridge scour, traffic control devices, and paving of dirt roads to meet federal non-attainment requirements. MCDOT plans to develop benefit-cost analysis methods to apply to other project types where applicable. (Please see the attached Small Area Transportation Studies, CM-10.c.-11, and the Project Scoring Program, CM-10.c.-12.)

The following programming categories are currently under development and are intended to be operational within the next fiscal year:

1. Intelligent Transportation System Projects
2. Advanced Right-of-Way Acquisition
3. Enhancement Projects: Projects that improve the appearance or functionality of the roadway and cannot be scored under another programming category
4. PM-10 Projects: Paving or dust control projects for the purpose of reducing airborne particulates

Please review the following attachments:

- CM-10.c.-1 Prolog Meeting Minutes
- CM-10.c.-2 Primavera Schedule
- CM-10.c.-3 JETS Report
- CM-10.c.-4 MCDOT LT - 26
- CM-10.c.-5 MCDOT LT - 38
- CM-10.c.-6 MCDOT LT - 13
- CM-10.c.-7 MCDOT LT - 02
- CM-10.c.-8 MCDOT LT - 17
- CM-10.c.-9 MCDOT Expedition Project Tracking Report
- CM-10.c.-10 MCDOT StratBENCOST Reports
- CM-10.c.-11 MCDOT Small Area Transportation Studies

- d. Please describe any ways in which the information technology currently in place for capital management either impedes or dramatically enhances your county's ability to manage its capital.

Each of the departments involved in Capital Improvement Programs utilizes different types of information technology systems, which are specific to their functions. Many of these systems are designed with specific goals that enhance capital reporting for the departments affected. Again, to ensure a complete understanding of each type of technology, each department is listed separately.

The Facilities Management Department (FMD) uses Arc View as the basis for its geographic information system (GIS). The GIS can be used to locate and identify County buildings and real estate assets. Through geocoding of the MAXIMO database, a comprehensive overview of the locations and functions of physical assets can be developed. This information is being used to optimize the siting of three proposed regional service centers. Using GIS, County planners can better understand the locations and relationships of present County facilities. Utilizing geographic data allows for the evaluation of potential sites through a grid-based suitability analysis. The suitability analysis uses a ranking of 12 geographic evaluation criteria to produce a GIS map of suitable sites to locate the regional centers.

The FMD also uses the custom application MCDUST to provide a visual representation for mapping and displaying County parcels. Using a relational database in conjunction with Arc View, the program is used to track 835 land parcels. Linked to digital aerial photos, this information is used to identify sites that may generate PM10 (dust) control violations. By tracking parcel information in relation to PM10 requirements, inspection data, contractor information, and compliance method, the FMD Real Estate Division tracks compliance with applicable Maricopa County Air Pollution rules and provides information for the State Implementation Plan for PM 10. (Please see the attached MCDUST Report for further information, CM-10.d.-1.)

Recently, the FMD partnered with the County's Electronic Business Center to televise over the web the view from a digital camera overlooking the construction site for the new Jackson Street Parking Structure and Clerk of the Superior Court Customer Service Center. The URL is:  
[http://ebc.maricopa.gov/videolibrary/player.asp?path=videos/FM\\_Video.asx&width=800&banner=Now](http://ebc.maricopa.gov/videolibrary/player.asp?path=videos/FM_Video.asx&width=800&banner=Now). The camera will later will be moved to future FMD

construction projects, thus enabling citizens and County managers to view County CIP construction in progress. (For a copy of a still photo taken by the camera, please see the attached picture of the Jackson Street Garage, CM-10.d.-2.)

The FMD has improved its design and construction procedures by increasing the use of the Internet to transfer information, such as meeting minutes, contract files, Autocad drawings, digital pictures, GIS files, product information, and specifications, etc., between owner (County), architect/engineer consultants, and contractors. This process expedites and resolves project issues quickly. Digital recordings are also used to document construction progress, as-built conditions, and document post construction operations and training sessions for County employees.

In regard to the Criminal Justice Facilities Development Department (CJFDD), current technology was specifically selected to support the Jail Expansion Program (JEP), and because of this ability to use selective technology, the JEP's ability to manage its capital is greatly enhanced. The JETS, Primavera, and Prolog programs allow the JEP to be managed proactively. Potential problems are identified ahead of time, issues are tracked and timely resolutions provided, and budget and schedule difficulties can be anticipated and resolved before they become a program impediment.

The appropriate use of technology has also allowed the program to be managed with a minimum number of staff. Without the current technology, the program would need to increase staff by over 200%, adding a significant cost factor, while also minimizing management capabilities.

The Maricopa County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) utilizes Primavera Project Planner (P3) and Microsoft Excel. These technology packages allow MCDOT to totally control schedules and costs and to discover potential problems. P3 provides a means for the Right-of-Way Division, Environmental Planning and the Operations Division to find out when portions of the projects need to be completed and to see how the activities mesh with those of other parties. Using this system of several software programs, electronic mail, and web pages, MCDOT has been able to improve the number of projects completed each year while improving customer service. Since MCDOT began using Primavera Project Planner, the department has seen the primary performance measure- Transportation Improvement Program expenditures- increase from \$21.1 million (58.8% of budget) in FY95 to over \$59.4 million (85.3% of budget) for the last fiscal year. For FY01, 85% of the projects planned to go to bid will actually go out to bid.

The Flood Control District (FCD) developed a project costing system so that the District can track total project costs. This system, however, is not an integrated one and depends on spreadsheets and multiple ancillary databases. Although the current system is accurate in tracking total project costs, FCD staff feels that an integrated system would expedite the process and eliminate the need for duplicative efforts. Therefore, the FCD Information Technology Division is in the process of redesigning the system so that it is more integrated.

Please review the following attachments:

CM-10.d.-1 MCDUST Report.

CM-10.d.-2 Jackson Garage Picture.

11. What obstacles does your county face that inhibit capital planning, project management, or maintenance? Also, does your county face any unusual challenges in the area of capital management?

Maricopa County has one of the fastest growing populations in the nation, which poses challenges in keeping up with the demand for County governmental services. The services impacted are in the areas of:

Civil and criminal justice. The demand for Superior Court services continues to grow.

Managing and maintaining roadways. Maricopa County is larger, in area, than seven states and more populous than 21 states. The County currently manages and maintains over 2,700 miles of roadways in a county that is more than 140 miles across at its widest point, and that varies in terrain from snow capped peaks to hot dry desert. The primary source of funding for roadways is State shared gas tax, which has not had an increase in more than 13 years. In addition, due to changes made to the distribution formula by the State legislature, over the past five years, the County's share of these funds has been reduced compared to all other counties in the state.

Despite these obstacles, Maricopa County Department of Transportation has continued to maintain the County roadway system such that 91.3 percent of all roadway miles are rated very good to excellent with respect to pavement condition. Also, of the County's 242 bridges and structures, 84 percent are currently rated above 80 and therefore classified as very good to excellent based on the federal condition rating. In order to maintain the County's transportation systems at this level, management systems have had to evolve rapidly to handle the volume of work brought about by such tremendous growth.

Population growth and building in former high flood risk areas. The population growth in Maricopa County is pushing people to build in former high flood risk areas such as agricultural lands, deserts, washes, and in areas beyond those that are protected by existing dams. This increases the risks to life and property, and the demand for flood control. To deal with this situation, the Flood Control District is trying to anticipate growth areas and remediate the flood hazards before development begins.



Expenditure limitation. The County is subject to an expenditure limitation imposed by state statute. This limitation restricts the County's ability to spend monies that may be available for capital related areas. (Please see the attached FY98-99 Expenditure Limitation Report, CM-11.-1.)

Please review the following attachment:

CM-11.-1 FY98-99 Expenditure Limitation Report.

12. Is there anything else you think we should know about capital management in your county? (For example, has your county developed any unique or innovative approaches to capital management?)

In the area of unique and innovative approaches and/or concepts, Maricopa County has initiated many.

Maricopa County has leveraged its investment in capital projects through collaborative efforts with private and public partners. For example:

The County recently replaced its outdated employee cafeteria with a state-of-the-art food court. The food court includes three nationally branded franchises, a bakery and "cook to order" facilities. The food court is a partnership with the County and the Eurest Corporation. The cost of the capital improvements were shared and the profits will also be shared. The County will recover its investment in less than 10 years. The result of this initiative is that employees, as well as the public, are offered a superior dining experience at no additional long-term cost to the taxpayer.

Other public-private partnerships include the County's three 18-hole golf courses that were developed by the private sector on County Park lands. In this partnership, no development costs were paid by the County. In fact, the private developer and operator of the courses actually pays rent to the County. Through these types of concession agreements, the General Fund of the County only contributes about 33 percent of the Parks operating budget.

In a public-public partnership, the County has recently begun to develop a solution to the homeless problem in the Downtown area. The project, known as the "Gateway campus", envisions a partnership between the County, Cities and State as well as several

social service agencies to provide housing, food, job training, job referral and health care to the more than 700 homeless people in the area.

In another public-public partnership, the County, the State of Arizona, and the Town of Cave Creek recently acquired the Spur Cross Ranch. Spur Cross Ranch consists of 2,154 acres of pristine, high desert that had been scheduled for commercial development. Acquisition costs were paid by the County, the State and the Town. Operating and development costs will be paid by the Town of Cave Creek. The County Parks department will manage the conservation area.

Other unique or innovative approaches and/or concepts include:

Creation of the Criminal Justice Facilities Development Department (CJFDD) to manage the Criminal Justice Construction Program; this department has a life span limited to the duration of the construction program. The Jail Expansion Program is clearly a massive, one-time capital construction program that does not require a continuing construction organization. The CJFDD is now managing approximately \$515 million in programming, design and construction and doing it with only five County employees and contract technical staff. This innovative approach to capital management has permitted the County to:

- minimize the number of in-house employees it has committed to the project;

- ensure that each employee is highly skilled and highly motivated;

- take advantage of contract staff of a caliber that the County simply cannot compete for in the labor market;

- tailor the organization, skills and qualifications of the contract staff for maximum efficiency and results; and

- maintain the ability to dissolve and otherwise absorb the entire organization when the project is complete.

Use of Alternative Procurement Methods for Construction. Beginning in 2000, the State of Arizona authorized the use of alternative procurement methods for construction, compared to the traditional design, bid, build method. During the pilot program phase of testing, the County initiated two projects using the design-build method: the 51st Avenue Bridge (Transportation Department) and the Jackson Street Parking Structure/Clerk of the Superior Court Customer Service Center. Both projects were accomplished well within their construction/design budgets and shaved months off their original planned project completion dates. As a result, the confidence level of the Board of Supervisors is very favorable for the use of alternative procurement methods. These methods are now permanently enacted into State law and adopted into the County Procurement Code for Construction and Related Architectural/Engineer/Consultant Services. As a result, the Facilities Review Committee recommended the use of a CM (Construction Manager) at Risk for the new County Public Service project, a new County office building planned for over 700,00 square feet of office and administrative space. (Please see the County

Procurement Code for Construction and Related Architectural/Engineer/Consultation Services, CM-12.-1. Additional information regarding this can be reviewed at the following Internet site:

[www.maricopa.gov/materials/p-code/HTML\\_code/Content.htm#ARTICLE5](http://www.maricopa.gov/materials/p-code/HTML_code/Content.htm#ARTICLE5)).

MCDOT's use of Primavera Project Planner version 3.0 is unique in the way that one project and 100 subprojects are grouped and sorted to produce reports as required to provide management information to identify problems and begin proactive resolutions. Primavera has just released Primavera enterprise version, which does the same thing that MCDOT has been doing for six years. Primavera has expressed an interest in meeting with MCDOT to view the operation since the company is interested in increasing its transportation business base and wants to see how MCDOT has been working and how MCDOT is planning to integrate Expedition with P3e.

Restoration of rivers, streams and washes saves Maricopa County taxpayers money, creates safer communities, and helps support a sustainable riparian environment. The philosophy of river restoration is practiced most commonly through the watercourse master plan program at the Flood Control District (FCD). Currently, the Agua Fria Watercourse Master Plan, the Skunk Creek Watercourse Master Plan, and the El Rio Vision are dedicated to restoring watercourses.

The Agua Fria Watercourse Master Plan is part of a broader effort in the West Valley to develop a regional recreation area along the Agua Fria and New River corridors. The master plan is a comprehensive flood control plan based on hydraulic analyses, future land use development, environmental considerations and the historic and possible future movement of the Agua Fria River. While accommodating existing uses, the watercourse master plan process involves bringing together public and private interests to identify unique characteristics that should be preserved. This study will lay the groundwork for the implementation of the West Valley Recreation Corridor, which has the potential to be the longest contiguous recreation corridor in the country. The Agua Fria Watercourse Master Plan should be completed by September 30, 2001. After this, the County Board of Supervisors will decide whether to approve the results of the study for the area within the unincorporated portions of Maricopa County. Each city along the corridor will also have the opportunity to adopt the study for their use. (Please see attached documentation for a further explanation of the master plan and West Valley Recreation Corridor, CM-12.-2.)

In August of 1999, the Flood Control District began development of the Skunk Creek Watercourse Master Plan. From a flood control perspective, the Skunk Creek Watercourse Master Plan will identify strategies to protect property and prevent future flooding problems. In the first phase of the master plan, the District's study team evaluated the historic and potential movement of storm water in the Skunk Creek and one of its main tributaries, Sonoran Wash. The study's goals are:

to protect existing and future residents from the 100-year flood event and possible damages associated with channel erosion and lateral migration of Skunk Creek and Sonoran Wash,

to consider structural, non-structural, and a combination of structural and non-structural alternatives,

to consider multiple-use opportunities for floodplain areas,

to minimize future expenditures of public funds for flood control and emergency management, and

to develop a watercourse management plan that generates widespread support and is implementable.

The Skunk Creek Watercourse Master Plan is a forward-thinking approach to flood control in that it considers the impacts of future development into all recommended solutions. This will save residents substantial tax dollars. (Please see attached documentation for further clarification of this master plan, CM-12.-3.)

The El Rio Vision is a seventeen mile watercourse master plan along the Gila River that extends from Phoenix International Raceway in Goodyear to Oglesby Road in Buckeye. Partners for the project include the surrounding cities of Buckeye, Avondale and Goodyear. Under the leadership of the District 5 Supervisor, the project began as a restoration effort to return the Gila River to its natural state while primarily accomplishing the goal of improved flood control. Currently, the river is choked with salt cedar bushes and has become the dumping place for trash, abandoned automobiles and appliances. With the efforts of the District and the partnering cities, the river could not only become beautiful and safe again, but could develop into a recreational corridor that brings high-end economic development to West Valley communities. The El Rio Watercourse Master Plan is currently in the scoping phase and should enter the planning stage by January, 2002. (Please see the attached documentation for further information on the El Rio Vision, CM-12.-4.)

Please review the following attachments:

CM-12.-1 County Procurement Code for Construction and Related Architectural/Engineer/Consultation Services

CM-12.-2 Agua Fria Watercourse Master Plan

CM-12.-3 Skunk Creek Watercourse Master Plan

CM-12.-4 El Rio Vision

*Thank you for your valuable assistance in providing this information.*

**Please provide the names, contact telephone numbers, and email addresses for those who completed this section of the survey:**

Name: Tom Manos Job Title: Chief Financial Officer

Phone: (602) 944-2504 Email: tmanos@maricopa.gov

Name: Bob Williams Job Title: Director, Criminal Justice Facilities Development Department

Phone: (602) 379-2326 Email: bwilliams@mail.maricopa.gov

Name: Chris Plumb Job Title: Director of MCDOT Planning

Phone: (602) 506-4176 Email: chrisplumb@mail.maricopa.gov

*As you know, Governing Magazine will follow up with interviews on the topics covered in this survey. To make sure that the proper people are interviewed, please provide suggestions and contact numbers below.*

**Who would you recommend that we contact for interviews about Capital Planning?**

Name: Chris Plumb Job Title: Director of MCDOT Planning

Phone: (602) 506-4176 Email: chrisplumb@mail.maricopa.gov

Name: Norm Hintz Job Title: Director, Facilities Management Department

Phone: (602) 506-8227 Email: norman.hintz@fm.maricopa.gov

**Who would you recommend that we contact for interviews about Project Management?**

Name: Bob Williams Job Title: Director, CJFDD

Phone: (602) 379-2326 Email: bwilliams@mail.maricopa.gov

Name: Chris Plumb Job Title: Director of MCDOT  
Planning

Phone: (602) 506-4176 Email:  
chrisplumb@mail.maricopa.gov

**Who would you recommend that we contact for interviews about Capital Maintenance?**

Name: Bob Williams Job Title: Director, CJFDD

Phone: (602) 379-2326 Email: bwilliams@mail.maricopa.gov

Name: Norm Hintz Job Title: Director, FMD

Phone: (602) 506-8227 Email:  
norman.hintz@fm.maricopa.gov